

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA  
NORTHERN DIVISION

RECEIVED

THE PAPER YARD, on behalf  
of itself and all others  
similarly situated

Plaintiff,

v.

ADVANTAGE HEALTHCARE, AMERILIST, INC., AUTAUGA BOTTLE WATER  
COMPANY, BLUE JAY, INC., CHELSEA MERCHANT SERVICES, INC., CLASSIC  
IMPRESSIONS, INC., MAIN LINE GRAPHIC EQUIPMENT, INC., MUTUAL BENEFIT  
FUNDING CORPORATION, OEM CONNECT, LTD., PRINTERS PARTS SUPERSTORE,  
SHIELDING STEEL, INC., SPINNAKER PRINTING, THOMAS LOYD, VISION LAB  
TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC., WSSCR, INC., and FICTITIOUS DEFENDANTS 1-9,  
whether singular or plural, who have sent out or caused to be sent out unsolicited advertisements  
to telephone facsimile machines owned and/or operated by Plaintiffs, and/or all others similarly  
situated, in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227,

Defendants.

)  
)  
)  
) Civil Action No. CU-05-115  
)  
)  
)

05-737

2005 AUG -4 P 12:14

DEBRA P. HACKETT, CLERK  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT ALA.

**DEFENDANT VISION LAB COMMUNICATIONS, INC.'S ANSWER TO COMPLAINT**

Defendant, Vision Lab Communications, Inc. ("Vision Lab"), answers each paragraph of  
Plaintiff's Complaint as follows:

1. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the  
truth of the allegations in paragraph 1, and therefore denies same.
2. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the  
truth of the allegations in paragraph 2, and therefore denies same.
3. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the  
truth of the allegations in paragraph 3, and therefore denies same.
4. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the  
truth of the allegations in paragraph 4, and therefore denies same.

5. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 5, and therefore denies same.

6. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 6, and therefore denies same.

7. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 7, and therefore denies same.

8. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 8, and therefore denies same.

9. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 9, and therefore denies same.

10. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 10, and therefore denies same.

11. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 11, and therefore denies same.

12. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 12, and therefore denies same.

13. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 13, and therefore denies same.

14. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 14, and therefore denies same.

15. Vision Lab admits that it is a Florida corporation with its principal place of business in Miami Beach, Florida. Vision Lab denies all allegations in paragraph 15 inconsistent therewith.

16. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 16, and therefore denies same.

17. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 17, and therefore denies same.

18. Paragraph 18 does not require a response from Vision Lab. However, to the extent it contains any allegation of statutory violations, wrongdoing, or tortious conduct by Vision Lab, these allegations are denied.

19. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 19, and therefore denies same.

20. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 20, and therefore denies same.

21. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 21, and therefore denies same.

22. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 22, and therefore denies same.

23. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 23, and therefore denies same.

24. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 24, and therefore denies same.

25. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 25, and therefore denies same.

26. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 26, and therefore denies same.

27. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 27, and therefore denies same.

28. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 28, and therefore denies same.

29. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 29, and therefore denies same.

30. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 30, and therefore denies same.

31. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 31, and therefore denies same.

32. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 32, and therefore denies same.

33. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 33, and therefore denies same.

34. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 34, and therefore denies same.

35. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 35, and therefore denies same.

36. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 36, and therefore denies same.

37. Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 37, and therefore denies same. Vision Lab expressly denies converting any property.

38. Paragraph 38 contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 38 and therefore denies said allegations.

39. Paragraph 39 contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 39 and therefore denies said allegations.

40. Paragraph 40 contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 40 and therefore denies said allegations.

41. Paragraph 41 contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 41 and therefore denies said allegations.

42. Paragraph 42 contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 42 and therefore denies said allegations.

43. Vision Lab repeats its answers to paragraphs 1-42 and restates them as if fully set forth herein.

44. To the extent this paragraph contains any allegations of statutory violations, wrongdoing, or tortious conduct by Vision Lab, they are denied. However, Vision Lab admits that the referenced statute is a written document which is, itself, the best evidence of its contents and denies all allegations in this paragraph that are inconsistent herewith.

45. Paragraph 45 contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Vision Lab denies the allegations in paragraph 45.

46. Paragraph 46 contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Vision Lab denies the allegations in paragraph 46.

47. Vision Lab repeats its answers to paragraphs 1-46 and restates them as if fully set forth herein.

48. Paragraph 48 contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 48. Vision Lab expressly denies converting any property.

49. Paragraph 49 contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 49, and therefore denies same.

50. Paragraph 50 contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Vision Lab denies the allegations in paragraph 50.

51. Paragraph 51 contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Vision Lab denies the allegations in paragraph 51.

52. Paragraph 52 contains legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Vision Lab lacks information or knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 52. Vision Lab expressly denies that its actions have caused any third party to incur damages.

As to the unnumbered paragraph and subparts (A)-(G) of that unnumbered paragraph, Vision Lab denies that this action is proper for treatment as a class action under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, that its acts or omissions violated any laws whatsoever, that Plaintiff and/or

the putative class are entitled to any damages, attorneys fees, injunctive relief, costs, expenses, or relief from it whatsoever.

### **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

Without assuming any burden of proof, this Defendant asserts the following affirmative defenses:

#### **First Affirmative Defense**

The TCPA unconstitutionally infringes on the First Amendment rights of both the sender and recipients of advertising facsimile communications.

#### **Second Affirmative Defense**

The TCPA is unconstitutionally void for vagueness with respect to its application to the facts of this case in that it fails to fairly inform the sender of facsimile transmissions who, if anyone, is liable for having "sent" advertising faxes.

#### **Third Affirmative Defense**

Plaintiff's claims for attorneys' fees should be dismissed because the TCPA does not provide for an award of attorneys' fees.

#### **Fourth Affirmative Defense**

Plaintiff has failed to properly plead its claims with sufficient particularity.

#### **Fifth Affirmative Defense**

Vision Lab does not have sufficient contacts with Alabama to subject it to personal jurisdiction in an Alabama court.

#### **Sixth Affirmative Defense**

Vision Lab pleads preemption.

#### **Seventh Affirmative Defense**

Plaintiff's damages, if any exist, were caused by third-parties for whom Vision Lab is not responsible.

**Eighth Affirmative Defense**

Vision Lab's acts or omissions were in accordance with all relevant statutes.

**Ninth Affirmative Defense**

Plaintiff cannot satisfy the requirements of Fed.R.Civ.P. 23 for maintaining a class action.

**Tenth Affirmative Defense**

Plaintiff cannot adequately represent the purported class.

Dated: August 4, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

VISION LAB TELECOMMUNICATIONS



Robert Baugh  
Christopher A. Bottcher  
Sirote & Permutt, P.C.  
2311 Highland Avenue South, Suite 500  
Birmingham, Alabama 35205  
(205) 930-5125

Timothy J. Rivelli  
Blaine C. Kimrey  
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP  
35 West Wacker Drive  
Chicago, IL 60610  
(312) 558-5600



**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that the foregoing has been served upon the following counsel of record for all parties to this proceeding by mailing a copy of same by United States mail, properly addressed and first-class postage prepaid, on this 4<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2005:

Brian D. Hancock, Esq.  
GARRISON SCOTT P.C.  
P.O. Box 11310  
Birmingham, Alabama 35202

Advantage Healthcare  
c/o James O. Driscoll  
4710 Bellaire Boulevard  
Suite 310  
Bellaire, TX 77401

AmerList, Inc.  
c/o Ravi Buckredan  
978 Route 45  
Suite L2  
Pomona, NY 10970

Autauga Bottle Water Company  
244 County Road 165  
Autaugaville, AL 36003

Blue Jay, Inc.  
c/o Jeffrey J. Whitehead, Esq.  
2431 West Horizon Ridge Parkway  
Suite #110  
Henderson, NV 89052

Chelsea Merchant Services, Inc.  
c/o Joseph Graley  
256 B Cemetery Road  
Canterbury, CT 06331

Classic Impressions, Inc.  
1045 W. Belmont Avenue  
Suite 200  
Chicago, IL 60657

Main Line Graphic Equipment, Inc.  
c/o Gelfuso & Lachut Inc.

1193 Reservoir Avenue  
Cranston, RI 02920

Mutual Benefit Funding Corp.  
6 Hutton Centre Drive  
Suite 1245  
Santa Ana, CA 92707

OEM Connect Ltd.  
c/o David W. Nash  
32A Holton Street  
Woburn, MA 01801-5205

Printers Parts Superstore  
c/o Ric Antinori  
1249 River Highway, Suite D  
Mooresville, NC 28117-9088

Shielding Steel, Inc.  
c/o John P. Miller  
2499 Glades Road  
Boca Raton, FL 33431

Spinnaker Printing  
20920 Romita Trail  
Boca Raton, FL 33433

Lloyd Thomas  
31 Victors Chase  
Sugarland, TX 77479

WSSCR, Inc.  
720 Brazos Street  
Suite 1115  
Dallas, TX 78701



---

OF COUNSEL